




152137  
\$

AMENDMENT TRANSMITTAL LETTER				Docket No. N9450.0023/P023	
Application No. 09/916,348-Conf. #9150		Filing Date July 30, 2001		Examiner K. R. Schubert	
				Art Unit 2137	
Applicant(s): Shoji Suzuki et al.					
Invention: HOME SERVER AND INTERNET SERVICE SYSTEM					
<b>TO THE COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS</b>					
Transmitted herewith is an amendment in the above-identified application.					
The fee has been calculated and is transmitted as shown below.					
<b>CLAIMS AS AMENDED</b>					
	Claims Remaining After Amendment	Highest Number Previously Paid	Number Extra Claims Present	Rate	
Total Claims	17	- 17 =		x	
Independent Claims	5	- 5 =		x	
Multiple Dependent Claims (check if applicable) <input type="checkbox"/>					
Other fee (please specify):					
<b>TOTAL ADDITIONAL FEE FOR THIS AMENDMENT:</b>					
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Large Entity <input type="checkbox"/> Small Entity					
<input type="checkbox"/> No additional fee is required for this amendment.					
<input type="checkbox"/> Please charge Deposit Account No. _____ in the amount of \$ _____. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.					
<input type="checkbox"/> A check in the amount of \$ _____ to cover the filing fee is enclosed.					
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Payment by credit card. Form PTO-2038 is attached.					
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The Director is hereby authorized to charge and credit Deposit Account No. <u>04-1073</u> as described below. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.					
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Credit any overpayment.					
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Charge any additional filing or application processing fees required under 37 CFR 1.16 and 1.17.					
				Dated: <u>November 14, 2005</u>	
Rachael L. Leventhal Attorney Reg. No.: 54,266  DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN & OSHINSKY LLP 2101 L Street NW Washington, DC 20037-1526 (202) 775-4742					



Docket No.: N9450.0023/P023  
(PATENT)

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of:  
Shoji Suzuki et al.

Application No.: 09/916,348

Confirmation No.: 9150

Filed: July 30, 2001

Art Unit: 2137

For: HOME SERVER AND INTERNET SERVICE  
SYSTEM

Examiner: K. R. Schubert

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION**

MS AF  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

The application has been reviewed in light of the rejection dated July 14, 2005.  
Claims 1-9 are pending in the application.

Claims 1-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by  
Bonnaure et al. (US 5,862,339). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1-5 recite, *inter alia*, "telephone number coincidence-checking means ... ,  
said telephone number coincidence-checking means includes means which do not  
hinder the operation of other telephone equipment including a fax telephone and using  
a common telephone line connected to said home server" (emphasis added.) Bonnaure  
et al. does not disclose this limitation. Bonnaure et al. discloses "the client software ...

can direct the client to dial its own assumed telephone number. If the dialed telephone number is not busy (i.e. a ring signal or disconnect signal is detected), the assumed client telephone number cannot be correct. If the dialed telephone number is busy, the assumed client telephone number probably is correct; because, most telephone numbers are not busy the vast majority of the time." Col. 6, ln. 10-18. Bonnaure et al. requires the telephone line to be busy and unavailable to other uses.

The Office Action states that "[m]eans which reject a connection and eliminate busy telephone line [sic] are means which do not hinder the operation of other telephone equipment." However, Bonnaure et al., however, ensures a busy telephone line, and therefore does not "eliminate busy telephone lines." The Office Action also contends that the WebTV may have a dedicated line, but that cannot possibly read on the claims 1-5 recitation of "using a common telephone line connected to said home server."

Furthermore, Bonnaure et al. does not solve the problems about the case of the common use of the telephone wire between the WebTV and the usual machines and apparatuses (fax machine, telephone, etc.). In the embodiments shown in Bonnaure et al., in the case where the telephone line is used, there is no disclosure of any matching of the machines and apparatuses in which the telephone wire is used nor is there any suggestion about the common use of the telephone wire between the usual machines and the apparatuses (fax machine, telephone, etc.) (the common use relating to the telephone wire and the conventional machines and the apparatuses).

In the WebTV server shown in Bonnaure et al., since the access is intercepted from the non-registered telephone number (the telephone number which has not registered), the illegal access is prohibited from the third party. In other words,

Bonnaure et al. prohibits access from the outside with the non-registered telephone number.


The present invention relates to the situation where the home server and the usual machines and the apparatuses (fax machine, telephone, etc.) are used commonly. According to the present invention, since access may occur from a non-registered telephone number from the outside, the access is not necessarily intercepted, but it performs the operation for securing access to the usual machines and apparatuses (fax machine, telephone, etc.) and it also detects the access to the home server.

Therefore, with the above stated functions obtained by the present invention, by controlling the access to the usual machines and the apparatuses (fax machine, telephone, etc.) and the access to the home server, even when the common telephone wire is used without the use of the plural telephone wires, it can realize that the both control of the home server and the control of the usual machines and the apparatuses (fax machine, telephone, etc.) are compatible.

Claims 6-9 depend from claim 1 and are patentable at least for the reasons mentioned above. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection of claims 1-9 be withdrawn. In view of the above amendment, Applicants believe the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: November 14, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Mark J. Thronson

Registration No.: 33,082

Rachael Lea Leventhal

Registration No.: 54,266

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN &  
OSHINSKY LLP

2101 L Street NW

Washington, DC 20037-1526

(202) 785-9700

Attorneys for Applicants